

Mendez, Leslie

From: james hensler <jchensler@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 25, 2016 1:33 PM
To: planning@cityofberkeley.info; Mendez, Leslie
Subject: Adeline and Russell Streets

My wife and I own 2915 1/2 Otis Street. We cannot be at tonight's Zoning Board Meeting. Parking in this entire area is abysmal. With overflow parking from Bart, with the Berkeley Bowl parking mess, with the Tibetan Temple, with the Library and with the generally congested nature of this entire area, IT IS CURRENTLY IMPOSSIBLE TO FIND PARKING at night, on the weekends, during the day, that is, AT ALL TIMES. Not providing adequate parking for the proposed building at Russell and Adeline is a huge mistake. Approving this project as proposed is not in the best interests of the current owners and residents in this area, nor for the City of Berkeley. Elected officials will be watched on this one.

JIM HENSLER

To: City of Berkeley Zoning Adjustments Board
From: Nicholas Townsend, resident at 1940½ Russell Street, Berkeley
Re: Proposed construction at 2902 Adeline Street
February 25, 2016

I own (since 1993), and live in one of the units of, the duplex at 1940 Russell Street (separated from the proposal site by one lot.

I object to the proposal to build an apartment building at 2902 Adeline Street because it:

1. is incompatible with the scale and character of the neighborhood as:
 - i) a human, social, and economic community
 - ii) a built environment
2. requires numerous variances from current code and zoning regulations
3. pre-empts current planning and community input for the Adeline Corridor and could be seen as a precedent for future construction
4. would cause a substantial loss of sunlight on my property at 1940 Russell Street and at the adjacent property at 1942 Russell Street

My objections are in line with the explicit regulations and design guidelines found throughout the City of Berkeley's planning documents. I address them in more detail in the following paragraphs.

Community. The surrounding neighborhood is, and has been historically, an area of small apartment buildings, duplexes, and single unit homes occupied by people with low and middle incomes including many families with children. (Significantly, the neighborhood has a higher proportion of children and of African Americans than Berkeley as a whole.) The proposed apartments will be unaffordable to most of the current residents of the neighborhood and they are clearly not intended for families with children. (There is, for instance, no place for play or recreation.) The presumed occupants would, therefore, have significantly different social and economic characteristics from current residents. This change in the neighborhood would accelerate two trends that should be of concern: the declining proportions of children and African Americans in the neighborhood and in Berkeley as a whole. My wife and I raised our children on Russell Street. Then and now, other children live next door and down the street. That is what it means to live in a family-friendly neighborhood. This apartment building would contribute nothing concrete to the children of the neighborhood: it would provide neither friends, space, services, nor adults directly concerned with the quality of schools and recreation facilities. It would actually displace the possibility of these things. (The increased property-tax revenue would contribute to the city's budget; I do not know how much of that money would be spent on the needs of neighbors and neighboring children.) These changes may not be intended but the proposed construction would have predictable impact.

The cost of housing in Berkeley is a universally recognized problem. The proposed building's contribution to low-income housing is totally inadequate to redress its impact on local housing costs. The impact of the 4 low-income units of affordable housing proposed would be overwhelmed by the addition of 46 dwelling units and 5 live work spaces which would be unaffordable for the residents of the neighborhood.

Built environment. There are no buildings of the proposed scale in this or surrounding neighborhoods. (I address Harriet Tubman Terrace below.) A 6-story building would be totally at odds with the scale

and appearance of surrounding structures. (Future plans for the Adeline Corridor might intend to change the character of this neighborhood, but as it stands the proposal is out of line with current zoning and existing buildings.

The only building of similar scale in the area is the Harriet Tubman Terrace. This 6-story building differs from the proposal in important ways: it is separated from the nearest other buildings by streets, notably by Milvia Street, it is setback from the surrounding streets, it was built decades ago and does not establish a precedent, and, most important, it is specifically reserved for low-income residents.

Zoning and regulation. As I understand it from the developers, the proposed apartment building would require variances or exceptions to current regulations. For a proposal to require exceptions in height, setback from the street, and parking (these are the ones I know about) shows clearly that it falls outside the intentions of current city planning. The 6-story façade facing Adeline presents an overwhelming cliff-face to passers by, there is nothing like it in the neighborhood.

Parking. Other correspondents have addressed the problems of parking. I live in a pedestrian friendly neighborhood and do not own a car so I know it is possible to do without but to expect that the residents of 50 apartments will be served by 24 parking spaces without enormous impact on the lives of their neighbors is so unrealistic that I find it hard to take seriously..

Sunlight. The proposed building would reduce the amount of sunlight on my property (and would have an even greater impact on the residents of 1942 Russell Street) particularly on morning light for several months of the year. I do not know whether this loss reaches the level of “significance” required by regulations, but it is a direct loss for me. (And I am concerned that a number of buildings along Adeline, none of which had a large individual impact, would between them deprive my property of significant sunlight.)

Thank you for your consideration of my objections. I hope that you will require significant changes to the proposal so that it may make a positive contribution to my neighborhood and community.

Mendez, Leslie

From: Clarke Teresa <tkclarke2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 10:37 PM
To: Mendez, Leslie
Subject: 2902 Adeline- Conditional Support - ZAB AGENDA 2/25/16

TO LESLIE MENDEZ, STAFF PLANNER

Leslie-

I live on Otis Street, one block from the proposed housing development, and have lived in this neighborhood for over 30 years.

In addition, I am very familiar with what constitutes good city planning: As a non-profit affordable housing developer for AHA, I developed 5 low-income and mixed use housing projects in Berkeley. Overall, I support the project and think it would be a positive addition to OUR Ashby BART neighborhood and the city. We need more housing in Berkeley and this location with its proximity to Ashby BART is an excellent site for high density housing. It will also improve the Adeline Corridor, helping to fill in the gaps in the city structure created by the BART station.

1) I SUPPORT THE REQUEST FOR A PARKING REDUCTION. Less parking available means less car ownership for the residents of the building, and more people using public transit and car share. This is a positive of the project and to the neighborhood, NOT a negative. LOVE ALL THE BIKE PARKING.

2) The HEIGHTS AND SETBACK FOR THIS SITE ARE ACCEPTABLE. Since this project is on Adeline, the higher heights are good with the scale of the street and the building steps down on Russell St.

3) I DO NOT SUPPORT THE LIVE/WORK ON ADELINE AND RUSSELL. THE LIVE WORK ON ADELINE AND AROUND THE CORNER SHOULD BE RETAIL/COMMERCIAL, AND NEEDS TO BE AN ADEQUATE SIZE FOR A SMALL CAFE ON THE CORNER. The RESIDENTIAL LOFTS on Russel ARE FINE. The small cafes in our neighborhood are thriving.

4) PARKING ON ADELINE IN FRONT OF THE BUILDING SHOULD BE RECONFIGURED TO BE DIAGONAL. THE PROJECT SHOULD PAY FOR SOME OR ALL OF THE COST OF THE RECONFIGURED DIAGONAL PARKING.

5) THERE SHOULD BE AT LEAST 20% LOW-INCOME UNITS UP TO 80% AMI. I THINK THE CITY SHOULD USE WHATEVER MEANS IT CAN LEGALLY TO ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPER TO INCREASE THE % OF LOW INCOME FROM THE 10%., AT THE VERY LEAST, THE EXISTING UNIT THAT IS BEING DEMOLISHED SHOULD BE ADDED TO THE 10%.

SINCERELY,

Teresa Clarke
2930 Otis Street
Berkeley CA 94703

Mendez, Leslie

From: Matt McNeil <matthew.mcneil@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 3:41 PM
To: Mendez, Leslie
Subject: Objection to proposed development at 2902 Adeline St.

Hello Leslie,

I would like to voice my concern about the proposed development at 2902 Adeline St. (Use Permit 2015-0177), particularly with regard to parking.

I live at 2840 Milvia St. (across the street from the proposed project) and parking is already very challenging. With 55 new residential units (and potentially 50-100 additional cars) and only 24 new parking spots, this proposal will have a significant negative impact on the current neighborhood residents.

Please do not offer a parking concession to the developer and instead insist that he changes the plan to either reduce the number of new units or increase the number of parking spots so that the plan include the full legally required amount of parking.

Sincerely,
Matt McNeil

2840 Milvia St.
Berkeley, CA 94703
510-847-3636

Jacob, Melinda

From: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: FW: Comments on 2902 Adeline Street

From: alexpakter@gmail.com [mailto:alexpakter@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Alex Pakter
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2016 6:59 PM
To: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB) <Planningzab@ci.berkeley.ca.us>
Subject: Comments on 2902 Adeline Street

Dear Zoning Board:

I live in the neighborhood of 2902 Adeline, and the parking in my neighborhood is terrible. During the weekends, I have to circle 2-3 times to find a parking spot. Sometimes I have to park 2 blocks away from my house, because of all of the people visiting the Ashby Flea Market, and the Thai Temple for Brunch. During the weekdays, our neighborhood serves as overflow parking for Ashby BART, and spots are hard to find.

The 2902 Adeline projects asks for a waiver of the parking requirements. This is not reasonable. They are adding 55 new units, which means around 100 new residents. If half of these people have cars (and half will), that means an extra 50 cars to park. Since the project only allows for 24 parking spaces, the remaining 26 cars will overflow onto the streets. Because of the Residential Parking Permit restrictions in this area (which Adeline St does not participate in), all of these cars will overflow onto a few blocks outside of the RPP zone.

The parking studies done by the developer are irrelevant and dated. They are five years old, and are in a completely different part of the city. For a waiver even to be considered, a new parking study should be done of this immediate area.

I have done my own parking study. It shows block after block with less than 3 available parking spaces. This project should not be allowed to continue without the developer meeting the minimum required parking spaces.

Thank you,

Alex Pakter
Berkeley, CA

Jacob, Melinda

From: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB)
Subject: FW: Comments regarding proposed Adeline/Russel Development

From: Jessica Trowbridge [mailto:jessstro@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 10:41 AM
To: Anderson, Maxwell <MAnderson@ci.berkeley.ca.us>
Cc: Zoning Adjustments Board (ZAB) <Planningzab@ci.berkeley.ca.us>
Subject: Comments regarding proposed Adeline/Russel Development

Dear Mr Anderson,

I am writing in regards to the proposed development on 2902 2908 Adeline and 1946 Russel Street.

I am a resident of this neighborhood and have been for the past 15 years. I beg that the proposed development be rejected. The development plan is not viable and does not fit in with the needs of the neighborhood.

First, the developers must have a viable plan for parking for their units. The plan currently includes 50 dwellings with parking spaces for 24 vehicles. This is unreasonable and poor planning. There needs to be parking space planned and available for each of the units in the space. Our neighborhood's parking is already impacted enough by the proximity of the Berkeley Bowl, the library, daily parkers from BART and the park.

Additionally, the addition of an apartment building that size will drastically change the neighborhood and I strongly believe that a smaller capacity building should be considered for that space (24 apartments to go with the parking spaces seems much more reasonable)

Finally, 4 units committed for low income housing is not enough. Our neighborhood is a working class neighborhood, where rising housing costs and increasing rents are already having a negative impact on who can afford to live and remain in the area, a building of this size will only continue to add to the problem of displacement and affordability.

[http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/uploadedFiles/Planning_and_Development/Level 3 - PHN/3026-02-09 ZAB PHN%20POSTCARD 2902%20Adeline.pdf](http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/uploadedFiles/Planning_and_Development/Level_3_-_PHN/3026-02-09_ZAB_PHN%20POSTCARD_2902%20Adeline.pdf)

Sincerely,

Jessica Trowbridge
2907 Martin Luther King Jr Way
Berkeley

Jacob, Melinda

Subject: FW: Proposed Housing Development at 2902 Adeline St, Berkeley

From: Margaret Radke [<mailto:mercats.3@ATT.net>]

Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 8:02 PM

To: Mendez, Leslie <LMendez@ci.berkeley.ca.us>; Planning Dept. Mailbox <Planning@ci.berkeley.ca.us>

Subject: Proposed Housing Development at 2902 Adeline St, Berkeley

2/24/16

Hello:

I strongly object to the proposal for 2902 Adeline (Adeline and Russell) unless on-site parking spaces are available for all tenants. And, where will all the guests of these tenants park?

There are already three housing developments within four-five blocks of this location. It appears that these developments will not have sufficient on-site parking for their tenants. Where will they park??? It's a domino effect as more street parking is lost.

Please don't approve this proposal without sufficient on-site parking.

Thank you.
Margaret Radke

Jacob, Melinda

Subject: FW: 2902 Adeline

From: Stephen Martin [<mailto:steve7890@gmail.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 7:05 PM

To: Mendez, Leslie <LMendez@ci.berkeley.ca.us>; Planning Dept. Mailbox <Planning@ci.berkeley.ca.us>

Subject: 2902 Adeline

Hello,

I live at 2908 Harper St. in Berkeley. I'm writing to ask that the proposed development at 2902 Adeline NOT be approved unless all 52 parking spots are supplied. The idea that people will be moving in to these apartments but not owning cars is ludicrous, although one has to admire the chutzpa of making such an argument.

Thank you.

Stephen Martin

Jacob, Melinda

Subject: FW: 2902 Adeline Street Development

From: Zonya Rauwolf [<mailto:toolgirl@tentacle.net>]

Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 2:15 PM

To: Mendez, Leslie <LMendez@ci.berkeley.ca.us>; Planning Dept. Mailbox <Planning@ci.berkeley.ca.us>

Subject: 2902 Adeline Street Development

Hi there.

I'm writing as a resident of 2926 Otis Street in Berkeley.

I would like to put in my opinion on the development at 2902 Adeline Street in Berkeley.

I think it should not be approved as is.

I want to be clear that I'm not against high density development. However, because the current proposal only includes half of the required parking I suggest one of two possible amendments.

Either don't approve it as is and require the developer to add in the usual required parking. Or conversely and this is my preferred option, leave the ratio of residents to parking spaces as is and legislate that the residents in the building are not allowed to have cars (since it is very close to BART) or only certain units are allowed to have cars or some such solution.

Mostly this is because the parking in the area is tricky as it is, especially on weekends due to the Flea Market and the Thai Temple.

Thank you for reading this and taking it into account.

Have a good day.

Warm Regards.

Zia Rauwolf.

--

Sent from my magic scroll. Please excuse my brevity.

Jacob, Melinda

Subject: FW: NO to 2902 Adeline unless they include all 52 parking spaces

From: mahvish.khan6391@gmail.com [<mailto:mahvish.khan6391@gmail.com>] **On Behalf Of** Mahvish Khan

Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 11:46 PM

To: Mendez, Leslie <LMendez@ci.berkeley.ca.us>; Planning Dept. Mailbox <Planning@ci.berkeley.ca.us>

Subject: NO to 2902 Adeline unless they include all 52 parking spaces

Hi LMendez,

I cannot be there for the Thursday meeting, but I want to say a NO to building the 6-Story structure at 2902 Adeline Street, unless they include all 52 parking spaces. I am a resident of 2910 Adeline Street and will be directly affected by this massive structure, and crowded parking.

Thank you.

Regards,
Mahvish

--